AVAILABLE AT PUBLIC TERMINAL FOR VIEWING ONLY 1 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 2 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. BATTAGLIA, JUDGE PRESIDING 3 4) CASE NO. 13-MD-02452-AJB 5 IN RE INCRETIN-BASED THERAPIES, PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION 6 7 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA JULY 1, 2014 8 11:18 A.M. 9 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO ALL CASES) 10 11 12 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS RE: CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 2.0 21 22 23 OFFICIAL REPORTER: JEANNETTE N. HILL, C.S.R. 24 (619)702-390525 JULY 1, 2014

2 1 SPEAKING APPEARANCES: 2 FOR PLAINTIFFS: HUNTER J. SHKOLNIK, ESQ. NAPOLI BERN RIPKA SHKOLNIK & ASSOCIATES 3 111 CORPORATE DRIVE, SUITE 225 LADERA RANCH, CALIFORNIA 92694 4 MICHAEL K. JOHNSON, ESQ. 5 JOHNSON BECKER PLLC 33 SOUTH SIXTH STREET, SUITE 4530 6 MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55402 7 RYAN L. THOMPSON, ESQ. WATTS GUERRA, LLP 8 5250 PRUE ROAD, SUITE 525 SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78240 9 FOR THE DEFENDANTS: DOUGLAS R. MARVIN, ESQ. WILLIAMS & CONNELLY LLP 10 725 12TH STREET NORTHWEST 11 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-5901 12 KENNETH KING, ESQ. NINA GUSSACK, ESQ. 13 PEPPER HAMILTON, LLP 620 EIGHTH AVENUE 14 NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10018 15 AMY J. LAURENDEAU, ESQ. O'MELVENY & MEYERS LLP 16 610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, 17TH FLOOR NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA 92660-6429 17 LOREN BROWN, ESQ. 18 HEIDI LEVINE, ESQ. DLA PIPER LLP 19 1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10020 2.0 21 22 23 24 25 JULY 1, 2014

AVAILABLE AT PUBLIC TERMINAL FOR VIEWING ONLY

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, JULY 1, 2014; 11:18 A.M.
DEPUTY CLERK: NUMBER ONE ON CALENDAR, CASE NUMBER
13MD2452, IN RE INCRETIN MIMETICS PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION.
THE COURT: AND GOOD MORNING TO ALL. AND WE HAVE
COMPLETED A RATHER LENGTHY IN-CHAMBERS CONFERENCE. MY
APOLOGIES FOR THOSE WHO HAVE WAITED FOR US TO COMPLETE, BUT
THERE HAS BEEN A LOT TO DISCUSS AS WE ENTER THE CRITICAL PHASE
IN THE CASE. AND I WILL DETAIL WHAT WE'VE DONE ON VARIOUS
ISSUES AND HOW THE CASE IS PROPOSED TO PROCEED ON A NUMBER OF
FRONTS.
SO LET ME HAVE COUNSEL THAT ARE PRESENT GO AHEAD AND
MAKE THEIR APPEARANCES FOR THE RECORD, AND WE CAN TAKE ROLL OF
THOSE ON THE PHONE. AND I WILL REPORT THE COURT'S ORDERS AFTER
THE DISCUSSION ON A VARIETY OF ISSUES.
SO STARTING WITH THE PLAINTIFFS, WOULD YOU FOLKS LIKE
TO GO AHEAD AND STATE YOUR APPEARANCES FOR THE RECORD.
MR. SHKOLNIK: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. HUNTER
SHKOLNIK, ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS.
MR. JOHNSON: YOUR HONOR, MICHAEL JOHNSON ON BEHALF
OF PLAINTIFFS.
MR. THOMPSON: YOUR HONOR, RYAN THOMPSON ON BEHALF
OF PLAINTIFFS.
THE COURT: AND THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS?

MR. DEPEW: FROM THE JCCP, YOUR HONOR, BRIAN DEPEW ON

25

PLAINTIFFS.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

18

MR. BERG: MICHAEL BERG FOR PLAINTIFFS, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: AND THEN LET'S GO TO THE DEFENSE SIDE FOR

THEIR INTRODUCTIONS OF THOSE IN COURT.

MR. MARVIN: YOUR HONOR, DOUGLAS MARVIN ON BEHALF OF

MERCK.

1	MS. GUSSACK: NINA GUSSACK FOR ELI LILLY.
2	MR. KING: KENNETH KING FOR ELI LILLY.
3	MS. LAURENDEAU: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR. AMY
4	LAURENDEAU FOR AMYLIN PHARMACEUTICALS.
5	MR. BROWN: LOREN BROWN FOR NOVO NORDISK.
6	MS. LEVINE: HEIDI LEVINE FOR NOVO NORDISK.
7	THE COURT: MS. TURNER?
8	MS. TURNER: VICKIE TURNER FOR MERCK.
9	MS. REYES: ANA REYES FOR MERCK.
10	MR. BOEHM: PAUL BOEHM FOR MERCK.
11	MR. SWINTON: STEVE SWINTON FOR ELI LILLY.
12	THE COURT: AND, SIR, ARE YOU HERE ON THIS CASE?
13	MR. KING: MICHAEL KING FOR NOVO NORDISK, YOUR HONOR.
14	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
15	AND LET'S SEE. I THINK WE'RE LOSING PEOPLE ON THE
16	PHONE, BUT, MS. LIU, ARE YOU THERE?
17	MS. LIU: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.
18	THE COURT: I SHOULD SAY, JUDGE HIGHBERGER, ARE YOU
19	THERE?
20	JUDGE HIGHBERGER: I AM, INDEED.
21	THE COURT: AND, MR. HOERMAN, ARE YOU THERE?
22	MR. HOERMAN: I AM HERE, JUDGE.
23	THE COURT: HOW ABOUT ROBERT MOSIER?
24	MR. MOSIER: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
25	THE COURT: JESSICA VANDEN BRINK? I'LL SCRATCH THAT.

1	LAUREN WELLING?
2	MS. WELLING: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
3	THE COURT: DAVID MCMASTER?
4	MR. MCMASTER: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
5	THE COURT: SASHA COFFINER?
6	MS. COFFINER: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
7	THE COURT: MICHAEL GOETZ?
8	MR. GOETZ: I AM HERE, YOUR HONOR.
9	THE COURT: RAY WILLIAMS?
10	MR. WILLIAMS: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
11	THE COURT: TRIPP SEGARS?
12	MR. SEGARS: YES, YOUR HONOR.
13	THE COURT: DAVID DEARING?
14	MR. DEARING: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
15	THE COURT: CAMILLE EDWARDS?
16	HOW ABOUT NEAL ELLIOTT, JR.?
17	MR. ELLIOTT: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
18	THE COURT: GREGORY VIDRINE?
19	HOW ABOUT ROBERT JAMES?
20	MR. JAMES: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
21	THE COURT: JOSEPH WAECHTER?
22	MR. WAECHTER: YES, YOUR HONOR. I'M HERE.
23	THE COURT: LORI RESTAINO?
24	KENNETH PEARSON?
25	MR. PEARSON: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.
	11

AVALLABLE AT BUBLIC TERMINAL FOR VIEWING ONLY
AVAILABLE AT PUBLIC TERMINAL FOR VIEWING ONLY
7
THE COURT: TIM BROWN.
MR. BROWN: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
THE COURT: ANDREW WILLIAMS?
MR. WILLIAMS: PRESENT.
THE COURT: PAUL STEVENS.
MR. STEVENS: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
THE COURT: PETER SNOWDON?
MR. SNOWDON: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
THE COURT: SCOTT EDSON?
MR. EDSON: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
THE COURT: ANDY JOHNSON?
MR. JOHNSON: HERE.
THE COURT: RAYMOND WILLIAMS?
MR. WILLIAMS: UNLESS THERE ARE TWO, I AM HERE, YOUR
HONOR. I THINK YOU CALLED ME EARLIER.
THE COURT: I DID? THERE IS AN ANDREW WILLIAMS AND
RAYMOND WILLIAMS.
MR. WILLIAMS: I MIGHT HAVE ANSWERED ON BEHALF OF
ANDREW. I APOLOGIZE.
THE COURT: IS ANDREW THERE? APPARENTLY NOT.
RAMON LOPEZ?
MR. WILLIAMS: YOUR HONOR, I AM HERE. I AM ANDREW

AND I'M HERE. I'M THE ONE WHO SAID PRESENT.

THE COURT: OH, OKAY.

HOW ABOUT RAMON LOPEZ?

1	MR. LOPEZ: RAMON LOPEZ IS HERE, YOUR HONOR.
2	THE COURT: KIMBERLY BARONE BADEN?
3	MS. BADEN: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
4	THE COURT: KEITH ALTMAN?
5	HOW ABOUT CHAFICA SINGHA?
6	MS. SINGHA: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
7	THE COURT: THOMAS HAKLAR?
8	MR. HAKLAR: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.
9	THE COURT: JOHN RESTAINO?
10	KEN BRENNAN?
11	MR. BRENNAN: HERE, YOUR HONOR.
12	THE COURT: DAE YEOL LEE?
13	SHAYNA SACKS?
14	NEIL OVERHOLTZ?
15	MR. OVERHOLTZ: YES, YOUR HONOR. I'M HERE.
16	THE COURT: NATHAN BESS?
17	ANYBODY I MISSED THAT IS ON THE PHONE THAT I DIDN'T
18	CALL?
19	MR. PLATTENBERGER: YES, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS JACOB
20	PLATTENBERGER FROM TOR HOERMAN LAW, ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS.
21	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.
22	ANYBODY ELSE?
23	MS. HEACOX: CATHERINE HEACOX FROM THE LANIER LAW
24	FIRM, FOR PLAINTIFFS.
25	THE COURT: GIVE ME YOUR NAME AGAIN?

1	MS. HEACOX: CATHERINE HEACOX, H-E-A-C-O-X.
2	THE COURT: GOT IT. AND ANYBODY ELSE?
3	MS. NASASH: MELISSA NASASH FROM THE LANIER LAW FIRM,
4	ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFFS.
5	THE COURT: COULD YOU SPELL THAT LAST NAME? I DIDN'T
6	HEAR IT.
7	MS. NASASH: SURE. N-A-S-A-S-H.
8	THE COURT: THANKS. ANYBODY ELSE? SOUNDS LIKE NOT.
9	ALL RIGHT. WE WORKED THIS MORNING INDUSTRIOUSLY ON
10	THE AGENDA THAT WAS FILED JOINTLY BY THE PARTIES. IT'S
11	DOCUMENT 500 ON THE DOCKET. AND I WILL GO THROUGH THIS AND
12	REPORT THE STATUS OR OTHERWISE THE DISPOSITION AND DIRECTION
13	THAT THE COURT HAS TAKEN. AND I WILL DO THAT AND THEN WE'LL
14	GIVE JUDGE HIGHBERGER A CHANCE TO COMMENT WITH REGARD TO THE
15	STATE PROCEEDINGS OR OTHER INFORMATION HE FEELS RELEVANT.
16	THE FIRST TOPIC WAS THE STATUS OF DOCUMENT
17	PRODUCTIONS, WHICH INCLUDED THE SUB-ISSUES OF CERTIFICATION,
18	THE POTENTIAL OF ADDITIONAL CUSTODIAL FILES THE PLAINTIFFS MAY
19	REQUEST, AND THE DATE AND SCOPE OF DEFENDANT LILLY'S
20	PRODUCTION.
21	CERTIFICATION AS THE FIRST STEP, WHICH WOULD RELATE
22	TO THE COMPLETENESS OF THE DISCLOSURES ORDERED BY THE COURT,
23	FOR THINGS LIKE FDA FILES AND WHATNOT.
24	MERCK HAS FILED A DOCUMENT INDICATING THAT THEY ARE
25	CERTIFYING THE COMPLETENESS OF THEIR RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S

ORDERED	PRODUCTION	

2.0

NOVO NORDISK HAS COMPLETED ITS PRODUCTION AS OF

JUNE -- I THINK IT WAS JUNE 16TH, AND IS GOING TO CHECK ON THE

LANGUAGE OF ITS CERTIFICATION, TO MAKE SURE IT IS CERTIFIED AS

COMPLETE TO THE BEST OF THEIR ABILITY, WITHOUT ANTICIPATED OR

INTENDED SUPPLEMENTS TO COME.

AMYLIN IS ABOUT TWO WEEKS AWAY FROM COMPLETING THE PRODUCTION AND CERTIFYING THE DISCLOSURES TO THE EXTENT REQUIRED BY THE COURT.

AND LILLY IS APPROXIMATELY FOUR WEEKS AWAY, AS A BEST GUESS, OF BECOMING COMPLETE.

AND THEN CERTIFICATION WOULD MEAN, THEN, TO THE BEST OF THE ABILITY, ALL DOCUMENTS RELATIVE TO THE COURT'S DIRECTED DISCLOSURES WOULD BE DONE.

VERIFICATION WITH REGARD TO THE INTERROGATORIES AND DOCUMENT REQUESTS THAT MAY OR MAY NOT OVERLAP WITH SOME OF THE COURT-ORDERED PRODUCTION, THOSE VERIFICATIONS SHOULD BE COMPLETE AS OF THE DATE OF PRODUCTION OR RESPONSE.

AND THEN THE COURT WILL VIEW THAT AS A FINITE DATE

FOR COMPLETION FOR PURPOSES OF ANY LATER-DISCOVERED OR

LATE-FILED, LATE-REVEALED DOCUMENTS, SHOULD AN ISSUE CREEP UP.

SO THAT'S THE CERTIFICATION STATUS. THAT ALSO SUBSUMED LILLY'S PRODUCTION ISSUE, AS FAR AS THE DOCUMENTS.

AND THEN LILLY WAS ALSO WORKING ON A DATE FOR THE CUTOFF OF DISCOVERABLE INFORMATION AND THE CUSTODIANS THAT

2.0

WOULD	BE RES	SPONSI'	VE TO	THE	DISCI	LOSURE	S REQU	JIRED	BY T	HE CO)URT
OR THE	E INTER	REST O	F THE	PLAI	NTIFE	TS WIT	TH REGA	ARD T	O SOM	E OF	THE
DISPOS	SITIVE	ISSUE	S THAI	C WIL	L BE	BROUG	HT IN	THE	EARLY	GOIN	ıg.

AND LILLY REPORTED THAT THEY HAVE NOW TEN CUSTODIANS WHOSE FILES WOULD BE PRODUCED, WOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR DEPOSITION. AND THE CUTOFF DATE WOULD BE THE SAME AS ALL OF THE OTHER CUSTODIANS FOR OTHER DEFENDANTS. THAT DATE BEING FEBRUARY 28TH OF 2014 AS THE END DATE FOR THE RELEVANT UNIVERSE, FOR PURPOSES OF DISCOVERY IN THE CASE. SO THAT IS ISSUE ONE.

THE PLAINTIFFS HAVE ANYTHING TO ADD THAT I MISSED OR MISSTATED ON THAT PARTICULAR SET OF ISSUES?

MR. JOHNSON: NO, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: HOW ABOUT ON THE DEFENSE SIDE?

MS. LEVINE: YOUR HONOR, ON BEHALF OF NOVO NORDISK,

JUST A SLIGHT TWEAK. OUR CERTIFICATION IS ACTUALLY COMPLETE.

IT MIRRORS THE LANGUAGE OF MERCK. IT DISCLOSES THAT WE HAVE

COMPLETED THE FDA AND THE EMA PRODUCTIONS AND EVERYTHING WE'VE

PRODUCED TO DATE, IN TERMS OF DOCUMENTS.

I THINK WHAT WE AGREED TO AMEND IS OUR WRITTEN

DISCOVERY RESPONSES -- ANSWERS TO INTERROGATORIES AND RESPONSES

TO REQUESTS -- SO THAT INSTEAD OF BEING IN THE FUTURE TENSE

THEY ARE THE PAST TENSE.

THE COURT: THANK YOU FOR REMINDING ME. THAT IS BETTER SAID AND THAT IS THE STATUS AS TO AMYLIN (SIC).

1 MS. LEVINE: NOVO.

2.0

THE COURT: MS. GUSSACK, WERE YOU GOING TO SAY

SOMETHING ABOUT LILLY?

MS. GUSSACK: YES, YOUR HONOR. I WAS JUST GOING TO MAKE THE OFFERS -- IN AN EFFORT TO MAKE SURE THAT OUR PRODUCTION OVER THE NEXT 30-SOME-ODD DAYS DOESN'T IMPAIR ANY FORWARD MOVEMENT -- THAT IF THE PLAINTIFFS WOULD ADVISE US AS TO WHICH CUSTODIAN THEY WANT FIRST FULLY COMPLETED. WE HAVE RIGHT NOW THE ABILITY TO AT LEAST PRIORITIZE THE SUPPLEMENTAL PRODUCTION THAT WE'RE DOING, IF THAT WOULD BE OF ASSISTANCE. OTHERWISE, WE'RE JUST GOING TO PLOW THROUGH AS WE BELIEVE APPROPRIATE.

BUT IN THE NEXT DAY OR TWO IF PLAINTIFFS WERE TO

ADVISE US WHO THEY WANTED FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD, WE COULD

MOVE THE OPERATION AROUND.

THE COURT: OKAY. SO LET THEM KNOW IF THAT IS

HELPFUL FROM YOUR STANDPOINT, AFTER YOU HAVE HAD A CHANCE TO

THINK ABOUT IT.

LET'S SKIP OVER NUMBER TWO. GO TO NUMBER THREE ON
THE AGENDA. THAT WAS THE DEPOSITION PROTOCOL. COUNSEL HAVE
BEEN WORKING ON THAT. AND THERE MAY BE A FEW ADJUSTMENTS TO BE
MADE IN LIGHT OF THE SCHEDULE THAT I HAVE CREATED FOR THE CASE,
THAT I WILL GET TO HERE IN A MINUTE. BUT OTHERWISE, IT'S
ANTICIPATED THAT THAT WILL BE SUBMITTED VERY SOON FOR ENTRY BY
THE COURT.

1	THE SAME IS TRUE WITH REGARD TO THE PRIVILEGED
2	PROTOCOL, THE LOG FORMAT. IT IS IN PROCESS, AND THE PARTIES
3	HOPE TO HAVE THAT COMPLETE SOON. THAT IS NUMBER 4.
4	NUMBER 5, SEALING OF DOCUMENTS AND THE PROTECTIVE
5	ORDER. THE NOTICE PROVISIONS ARE BEING COMPLETED. AND THAT IS
6	HOPED TO BE SUBMITTED SOON, AND COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATE RULES
7	OF COURT OR THE JCCP WILL BE CONSIDERED WHERE RELEVANT THERE.
8	FROM THE PLAINTIFFS' STANDPOINT, IS THAT A FAIR,
9	ALBEIT BRIEF, ASSESSMENT OF POINTS THREE, FOUR, AND FIVE ON THE
10	AGENDA?
11	MR. JOHNSON: YOUR HONOR, IT IS.
12	THE COURT: HOW ABOUT FROM THE DEFENSE? WOULD YOU
13	FOLKS CONCUR ON THAT?
L 4	MR. KING: YES, YOUR HONOR.
15	MR. MARVIN: YES.
16	THE COURT: YES. NUMBER SIX ON THE AGENDA WAS THE
17	DECEDENT ESTATE ORDER PERHAPS MORE PROPERLY STATED A
18	DECEDENT ESTATE STIPULATION TO ALLOW FOR A NOVEL BUT
19	IMPORTANT APPROACH TO DOCUMENTING THE REAL PARTY IN INTEREST,
20	OR AT LEAST CREATING AN INTERIM PLAN TO DO THAT.
21	COUNSEL WILL BE DISCUSSING THAT FURTHER AS IT RELATES
22	TO THE ISSUE OF MINORS, DECEDENT ESTATE DECEDENT
23	TESTAMENTARY DOCUMENT POTENTIALS AND THE EXISTENCE OF A SUNSET
24	PROVISION. THE COURT HAS URGED THE ASSIGNED REPRESENTATIVES

FOR EACH SIDE TO CONTINUE ON THAT AND CONTACT THE COURT IF

1	THERE IS A NEED TO DISCUSS FURTHER IN THE SHORT TERM, AND THEN,
2	PERHAPS, NEGOTIATE OR ADJUDICATE WHAT WE FEEL WE CAN ALL LIVE
3	WITH ON THOSE ENDS. SO THAT IS THE OPEN OFFER TO THOSE WORKING
4	ON THAT.
5	ANYTHING ELSE ON THE DECEDENT ESTATE STIPULATION FROM
6	THE PLAINTIFFS' SIDE, FOR NOW?
7	MR. THOMPSON: NO, YOUR HONOR.
8	THE COURT: HOW ABOUT THE DEFENSE SIDE, MR. MARVIN?
9	MR. MARVIN: NO, YOUR HONOR.
10	THE COURT: NUMBER SEVEN IS THE COORDINATION OF THE
11	THYROID CANCER CASES. THEY HAVE ALL BEEN NOW COORDINATED
12	OUTSIDE OF THE MDL AND TO BE HANDLED JOINTLY BY THE COURT.
13	COUNSEL ARE WORKING ON MASTER PLEADINGS, WITH AN
14	ANTICIPATED STAY ON THE ANSWERS UNTIL THE MASTER PLEADINGS CAN
15	BE PUT INTO PLACE. THAT WOULD INCLUDE MASTER COMPLAINT/MASTER
16	ANSWER.
17	IT'S ANTICIPATED THAT MANY OF THE PROTOCOLS THAT HAVE
18	BEEN PUT IN PLACE OR WILL SOON BE IN PLACE IN THE MDL WILL
19	APPLY OR BE UTILIZED IN THE THYROID CANCER CASES.

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE JCCP-STYLE PLAINTIFFS' QUESTIONNAIRE INFORMATION, I BELIEVE, IS CONTEMPLATED TO BE USED IN THOSE. BUT ALL OF THAT IS IN PROCESS, AND WE'LL TALK ABOUT THE STATUS OF THAT NO LATER THAN THE NEXT CONFERENCE THAT IS NOW SET FOR AUGUST 14TH IN THIS COURT.

IS THAT A FAIR RENDITION OF WHAT WE ARE DOING ON

THOSE CASES, ON THE PLAINTIFFS' SIDE?

1.3

2.0

MR. THOMPSON: I BELIEVE SO, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: HOW ABOUT ON THE DEFENSE, MR. KING?

MR. KING: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: OKAY. SO NUMBERS EIGHT AND NINE I'LL DISCUSS CONCURRENTLY. THE REQUEST IS MADE TO RELIEVE COUNSEL, OR AT LEAST BE MORE FLEXIBLE, WITH REGARD TO THE 45-DAY RULE THAT IS ENFORCED BY JUDGE DEMBIN AS IT RELATES TO DISCOVERY MOTIONS IN GENERAL, INCLUDING NOW TO THIS MDL.

AND I HAVE DETERMINED THAT IT IS AN IMPRACTICAL

DEADLINE AS IT RELATES TO THE NOW MILLIONS OF DOCUMENTS AND

ELECTRONIC INFORMATION THAT HAS BEEN AND IS CONTINUING TO BE

PRODUCED TO THE PLAINTIFFS. AND SO I'M GOING TO RELIEVE THE

PARTIES OF THAT OBLIGATION, USING, INSTEAD, A MORE LIBERAL,

REASONABLE DILIGENCE STANDARD, SUCH THAT COUNSEL NEED TO

REASONABLY MOVE FORWARD WHEN THEY DISCOVER DISPUTES WITH REGARD

TO PRODUCTIONS OF ANY OF THE DISCOVERY IN THE CASE.

AND IN THAT STEAD, LOGISTICALLY, I'M GOING TO

UNDERTAKE THE DISCOVERY-RELATED ISSUES DIRECTLY, CONCERNING THE

CURRENT STATUS QUO, AS IT WILL LEAD US TO ISSUES OF FIRST

PREEMPTION AND THEN GENERAL CAUSATION; HOPING THAT THAT WILL

MOVE THE SCHEDULE FASTER, SINCE I HAVE A GREAT DEAL MORE

KNOWLEDGE NOW OF THIS PARTICULAR LITIGATION THROUGH THE BENEFIT

OF THE STATUS CONFERENCES THAT I HAVE PARTICIPATED IN WITH, I

BELIEVE, COUNSEL ON BOTH SIDES.

2.0

THE LOGISTICS WILL BE THAT COUNSEL NEED TO MEET AND CONFER AND DECIDE THE NECESSARY PAGE LIMITS BY AGREEMENT, TO ADDRESS THE ISSUES THAT ARE ON. THAT WOULD RELIEVE THEM OF THE FIVE-PAGE LIMIT THAT HAS BEEN UTILIZED BY JUDGE DEMBIN. AND SINCE HE'S NOT DOING IT, I DON'T THINK HE'LL MIND.

SO IS THAT A FAIR ASSESSMENT OF WHAT WE HAVE DONE WITH ITEMS EIGHT AND NINE, ON THE PLAINTIFFS' SIDE?

MR. SHKOLNIK: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: HOW ABOUT ON THE DEFENSE SIDE?

MR. MARVIN: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: AND AS I SAID, FOR THOSE THAT WEREN'T PRIVY TO THE CONVERSATION, BOTH SIDES ARE VERY INDUSTRIOUS AND VERY ZEALOUS IN REGARDS TO THEIR CASES AND THE MANNER IN WHICH THE MATTER SHOULD PROCEED. AND THE COURT APPRECIATES ALL OF THAT, EVEN WHEN I DON'T AGREE WITH SOME OF THE POSITIONS. BUT IT'S MUCH APPRECIATED. AND I WOULD ASSURE THE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, OR THOSE THAT WEREN'T PRIVY, THAT THE LAWYERS ARE WORKING ARDENTLY.

AND THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT DISPUTE OR DEBATE ABOUT

HOW THE CASE SHOULD BE SCHEDULED IN TERMS OF TIMING. AND THE

COURT HAS CHOSEN, HAVING HEARD THE ARGUMENTS, TO SET A FAIRLY

AGGRESSIVE -- MAYBE SOME WOULD SAY OVERLY AGGRESSIVE, BUT I

WILL JUST SAY A VERY AGGRESSIVE SCHEDULE TO START THIS PROCESS

MOVING.

ON AUGUST 14TH, AT 9:00, WE'LL HOLD THE NEXT STATUS

1.3

2.0

CONFERENCE, AT WHICH POINT THE PLAINTIFFS CAN LIST, IN ADVANCE,
THE ISSUES OF ANY GAPS OR LACKING IN THE PRODUCTION OF THE

VARIOUS DEFENDANTS, WHICH MIGHT ALTER SOME OF THESE DATES THAT

I'M SETTING OR MIGHT CAUSE SOME CHANGING IN HOW DEPOSITIONS AND

WHATNOT MIGHT PROCEED.

I DON'T WANT TO FORECAST HOW IT'S GOING TO COME OUT,
BUT THERE IS ANY NUMBER OF ALTERNATIVES. AND CERTAINLY IF
THERE IS A NEED TO DISCUSS IT SOONER, COUNSEL CAN ALWAYS ASK
FOR A SOONER STATUS CONFERENCE IF THERE IS A PARTICULAR MATTER
THAT LOOKS LIKE IT'S GOING TO BE A REAL SIGNIFICANT PROBLEM.
BUT NO LATER THAN AUGUST 14TH WE'LL RESOLVE THAT. AND THE
9:00 MEETING FOR THE LEAD COUNSEL AND A 10:00 PUBLIC
CALENDAR -- AT LEAST HOPEFULLY A 10:00 -- TO UPDATE THINGS
FURTHER.

BUT FOR NOW, THE COURT IS ORDERING THE DEPOSITIONS OF THE CUSTODIANS THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED. THERE ARE, ESSENTIALLY, 35 THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED. FOR THOSE KEEPING TRACK, MERCK HAS TEN CUSTODIANS. LILLY HAS TEN. NOVO NORDISK HAS SEVEN. AMYLIN EIGHT. SO THAT'S 35.

SOME OF THESE FOLKS HAVE BEEN DEPOSED PREVIOUSLY, SO THERE IS THAT INFORMATION OUT THERE. AND THE COURT HAS URGED COUNSEL TO SCHEDULE THOSE PERHAPS IN THE MOST MEANINGFUL WAY, TO GET TO THE ESSENCE OF WHAT WOULD BE THE PREEMPTION AND CAUSATION ISSUES THAT MIGHT THEN OBVIATE THE NEED FOR ALL 35. BUT I WILL LEAVE THAT TO THEIR DISCRETION.

	S	O DEPOS	S NEED	TO BE	COMMENC	ED 9/2	OF 14.	I'M	SETTING
A C	OMPLETIO	N DATE	FOR T	HE DEP	OSITIONS	OF O	CTOBER	17 OF	2014.
	Т	HAT IS	GOING	TO LE	AD TO A 1	PLAINT	IFF DIS	CLOSUI	RE OF
EXPI	ERTS AND	THEIR	REPOR	TS ON	BOTH THE	PREEM	PTION A	ND CAU	JSATION

ISSUES. NOVEMBER 17TH FOR PLAINTIFF. DEFENSE WILL FILE THEIR

DISCLOSURES FROM THEIR EXPERTS ON THOSE ISSUES BY

7 DECEMBER 14TH.

1.3

2.0

PLAINTIFF WILL HAVE REBUTTAL REPORTS, ENVISIONING
THAT THE DEFENSE, IN THEIR DECEMBER 17TH REPORTS, WILL BE
ADDRESSING PREEMPTION, AS THEY BEAR THE BURDEN OR THE FIRST
STEP. AND PLAINTIFFS WILL THEN REBUT JANUARY 30.

FROM THERE, DEPOSITIONS OF THE EXPERTS WILL NEED TO BE COMPLETE BY MARCH 6 OF 2015, WHEREUPON THE PREEMPTION MOTION CAN BE RE-CALENDARED, RE-FILED, AND ADDRESSED TO BE FOLLOWED THEREAFTER, AS APPROPRIATE WITH THE GENERAL CAUSATION.

I ANTICIPATE SETTING OTHER STATUS CONFERENCES BETWEEN AUGUST 14TH AND MARCH 6TH, THE DEPOSITION CUTOFF, BUT I THINK WE'LL DO THAT AS WE GO FORWARD, SETTING THE NEXT CONFERENCE AT THE AUGUST 14TH HEARING, DEPENDENT UPON WHERE WE STAND ON ANY OF THE ISSUES THAT I HAVE ADDRESSED PREVIOUSLY.

SO AS TO A REPORT OF WHAT I'M DOING TO ALL OF YOU, IS
THAT A FAIR RENDITION OF WHAT THE COURT'S VIEW IS FROM THE
PLAINTIFFS' SIDE?

MR. SHKOLNIK: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: AND I WOULD SAY EVERYBODY FEELS PAIN

1	ABOUT SOME OF THIS, SO WE ARE ALL IN GOOD STEAD.
2	IS THIS A FAIR RENDITION ON THIS FROM THE DEFENSE
3	STANDPOINT?
4	MR. MARVIN: YES, IT IS, YOUR HONOR.
5	THE COURT: THAT WOULD COMPLETE THE AGENDA.
6	JUDGE HIGHBERGER, LET ME TURN THE FLOOR OVER TO YOU,
7	SIR, FOR THOUGHTS OR REPORTS YOU WOULD LIKE TO SHARE.
8	JUDGE HIGHBERGER: THANK YOU, JUDGE BATTAGLIA.
9	A COUPLE OF COMMENTS. A POINT OF INFORMATION: THE
10	PANCREATITIS CASE IS PENDING IN THE STATE-COORDINATED MATTER TO
11	PROCEED. THEY HAVE RECKONED IN THEIR OWN WAY IN TIMES PAST.
12	THERE WERE TWO PLAINTIFFS SET FOR A SINGLE TRIAL DATE THIS
13	OCTOBER. I'M BEST ADVISED THAT HAVING DEALT WITH SOME
14	INTERESTING CHOICE OF LAW QUESTIONS, THE PARTIES HAVE RESOLVED
15	THE KATZ CASE, LEAVING ONLY THE MCMULLIN CASE FOR OCTOBER.
16	THAT REMAINS ON CALENDAR, ALTHOUGH I BELIEVE THERE
17	WERE PREDICTIONS THAT A DEFENSE SUMMARY JUDGMENT MIGHT BE IN
18	THE OFFING.
19	NEXT MAY, WHAT WE CALL TRACK FOUR OF THE PANCREATITIS
20	CASES ARE SET. WE'RE DOWN TO ABOUT APPROXIMATELY TEN SUCH
21	CASES AND THEY'RE RIPENING IN THE ORDINARY COURSE.
22	COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS, DID I HEAR MR. DEPEW IN THE
23	ROOM?
24	THE COURT: HE IS HERE.
25	JUDGE HIGHBERGER: DO YOU CONCUR WITH THAT STATEMENT

1	ABOUT THE STATUS OF THE PANCREATITIS CASES?
2	MS. CROOKE: THIS IS ELIZABETH CROOKE. YES, WE DO,
3	YOUR HONOR.
4	JUDGE HIGHBERGER: I DIDN'T HEAR THE RESPONSE.
5	THAT'S MS. CROOKE, ALSO?
6	THE COURT: YES.
7	JUDGE HIGHBERGER: BUT IT WAS A YES?
8	THE COURT: IT WAS A YES.
9	MS. CROOKE: YES.
10	THE COURT: AND MR. DEPEW IS NOT PROTESTING.
11	JUDGE HIGHBERGER: MR. GOETZ, ANY DISAGREEMENT?
12	MS. CROOKE: I'M SORRY?
13	JUDGE HIGHBERGER: I ASKED MR. GOETZ, FOR DEFENDANT,
14	TO CONCUR.
15	THE COURT: HE'S ON THE PHONE.
16	MR. GOETZ?
17	MS. LAURENDEAU: THIS IS AMY LAURENDEAU FOR AMYLIN,
18	YOUR HONOR.
19	JUDGE HIGHBERGER: ANY COUNSEL FOR LILLY OR AMYLIN IN
20	THE ROOM? MS. LAURENDEAU?
21	THE COURT: SHE IS JUST ABOUT TO SPEAK, JUDGE.
22	MS. LAURENDEAU: YES, YOUR HONOR. IT'S AMY
23	LAURENDEAU. WE CONCUR WITH YOUR STATEMENTS OF THE STATUS OF
24	THE JCCP.
25	JUDGE HIGHBERGER: OKAY. TURNING TO PANCREATIC

2.0

CANCER, OBVIOUSLY THOSE CASES ARE OF EQUAL IMPORTANCE IN THE COORDINATING PROCEEDING. I CONCUR WITH THE SCHEDULE THAT JUDGE BATTAGLIA IS SETTING UP. THE NEXT EVENT FOR THE BYETTA CASE IN MY COURT IS ON JULY 29TH AT 9:30. AND I WILL SET AN ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE, RETURNABLE ON JULY 29TH AT 9:30, IN DEPARTMENT 307, WHY THE COURT SHOULDN'T ADOPT THE SAME SCHEDULE FOR DISCOVERY THAT IS BEING ADOPTED BY THE FEDERAL COURT, FOR PURPOSES OF RIPENING THE CASE, PARTICULARLY IN REGARD TO A GENERAL CAUSATION; BUT ALSO INSOFAR AS ANYBODY WANTS TO RAISE AN ISSUE OF FEDERAL PREEMPTION AS A DEFENSE IN THE COORDINATED PROCEEDINGS REGARDING PANCREATIC CANCER.

ANY OPPOSITION TO THE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE SHOULD BE SERVED BY JULY 14TH. ANY REPLY IN SUPPORT OF THE ORDER BEING ADOPTED SHOULD BE SERVED BY JULY 24.

AND THE OTHER POINT OF NOTE IS THAT WHILE I HAVE BEEN URGED BY THE PLAINTIFFS IN MY COURT, AS TO THE PANCREATIC CANCER, TO TRY TO KEEP THINGS MOVING, GET THINGS MOVING, IT WAS NOTABLE THAT TODAY, AT LEAST AS I HEARD IT, IT WAS THE DEFENDANTS WHO WERE TRYING TO PULL CUTOFFS FOR DISCOVERY AND MOTION PRACTICE EARLIER, AND THE PLAINTIFFS FELT THAT THEIR EFFORTS TO PROPERLY REPRESENT THEIR CLIENTS WOULD REQUIRE THEM TO BE THOROUGH ENOUGH TO GO THROUGH THE EXTENSIVE MATERIAL THEY HAVE RECENTLY RECEIVED, MILLION OF PAGES. THAT MIGHT WELL BE THE CASE, WHICH IS, I ASSUME, WHY PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL ASKED FOR THE EXTRA TIME.

	22
1	BUT I WOULD BE INTRIGUED IF THE PLAINTIFFS COME
2	BEFORE ME AND ALL OF A SUDDEN WANT AN EXPEDITED SCHEDULE AFTER
3	HAVING REQUESTED THAT THINGS BE EVEN LESS EXPEDITED THAN WHAT
4	JUDGE BATTAGLIA IS CURRENTLY ORDERING.
5	SO I WILL WAIT WITH INTEREST TO SEE IF PLAINTIFFS ARE
6	CONSISTENT IN THE NEXT PROCEEDING IN FRONT OF ME, OR FOR SOME
7	REASON EXPRESS A DIFFERENT VIEW.
8	I THINK THAT IS ALL I NEED TO SAY, UNLESS PLAINTIFFS'
9	COUNSEL OR DEFENSE COUNSEL WISH TO RESPOND HERE AND NOW TO THE
10	LAST OBSERVATION.
11	THE COURT: PLAINTIFFS HAVE ANY RESPONSE TO JUDGE
12	HIGHBERGER'S LAST FEW OBSERVATIONS?
13	MR. DEPEW: YES. WE HAVE PREVIOUSLY, ON TWO
14	OCCASIONS, BROUGHT TO JUDGE HIGHBERGER'S ATTENTION OUR CONCERN
15	FOR INCOMPLETE PRODUCTION WITH RESPECT TO AMYLIN AND LILLY.
16	AND WE WERE NOT ANTICIPATING THIS SCHEDULE, ALTHOUGH WE DID
17	HAVE REASON TO BELIEVE THAT THERE WERE SERIOUS CONCERNS.
18	BUT WHAT I WOULD ASK JUDGE HIGHBERGER IS SHALL WE NOW
19	FORMALLY BRING A MOTION OR BRING THIS TO YOUR ATTENTION IN A
20	MORE FULLY DEVELOPED WAY, SINCE YOU ARE NOW SETTING THIS O.S.C.
21	SCHEDULE FOR JULY?
22	JUDGE HIGHBERGER: I WOULD THINK THAT IF THERE IS
23	SOME UNFINISHED PIECE OF BUSINESS THAT YOU THINK IS NOT
24	INCAPSULATED WITH WHAT'S HAPPENED OR IS ABOUT TO HAPPEN IN THE

FEDERAL MDL, THAT YOU SHOULD BRING IT TO THE COURT'S ATTENTION

25

1	ON JULY 29. AND IF YOU THINK IT OUGHT TO BE FORMAL EX PARTE OF
2	A NOTICED MOTION, IF IT'S STILL TIMELY FOR JULY 29, USE YOUR
3	GOOD JUDGMENT.
4	MR. DEPEW: WE WILL DO THAT, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU
5	FOR THAT OPPORTUNITY.
6	THE COURT: AND ANYTHING FROM THE DEFENSE SIDE ON THE
7	JCCP OR JUDGE HIGHBERGER'S STATEMENT?
8	ANYTHING ON THE PLAINTIFFS' SIDE? I WILL GIVE YOU
9	THE OPPORTUNITY TO BRING IT UP. I THINK WE COVERED ALL OF THE
10	ISSUES, BUT IF THERE IS ANYTHING ELSE YOU STILL FEEL NEEDS TO
11	BE SAID, I'LL GIVE YOU THAT CHANCE.
12	MR. SHKOLNIK: NO, YOUR HONOR. I THINK WE'VE COVERED
13	IT ALL.
14	THE COURT: HOW ABOUT THE DEFENSE SIDE?
15	MS. GUSSACK: NO, SIR.
16	THE COURT: OKAY. SO YOU FOLKS ON THE PHONE, THANK
17	YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PATIENCE.
18	AND JUDGE HIGHBERGER, THANKS AS ALWAYS FOR YOUR
19	CONTINUED COOPERATION. IT'S MUCH APPRECIATED.
20	AND WE'LL SET OUT AN ORDER FOR THE SCHEDULE FOR THE
21	CASE AS WE HAVE SET IT, AND CONFIRMING THE NEXT STATUS
22	CONFERENCE FOR CHECKING ON THESE MANY THINGS AND ADDRESSING,
23	CERTAINLY, ANY ISSUES WITH REGARD TO THE LACK OF COMPLETENESS,
24	AS I MENTIONED.

SO YOU FOLKS HAVE A GREAT DAY AND A HAPPY 4TH OF

25

24 1 JULY, AND WE'LL BE IN TOUCH. 2 MR. SHKOLNIK: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 3 MR. MARVIN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 4 THE COURT: WE ARE IN RECESS. (PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 11:47 P.M.) 5 6 CERTIFICATION 7 I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I AM A DULY APPOINTED, QUALIFIED AND ACTING OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER FOR THE UNITED 8 STATES DISTRICT COURT; THAT THE FOREGOING IS A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS HAD IN THE AFOREMENTIONED CAUSE 9 ON JULY 1, 2014; THAT SAID TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPTION OF MY STENOGRAPHIC NOTES; AND THAT THE FORMAT USED HEREIN COMPLIES WITH THE RULES AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE 10 UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CONFERENCE. 11 DATED: JULY 2, 2014, AT SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA. 12 13 JEANNETTE N. HILL, OFFICIAL REPORTER, CSR NO. 11148 14 15 16 17 18 19 2.0 21 22 23 24 25 JULY 1, 2014

AVAILABLE AT PUBLIC TERMINAL FOR VIEWING ONLY